



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,402	03/01/2000	Neta Amit	1018.072US1	2983
23460	7590	01/24/2005	EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780			NORRIS, TREMAYNE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/516,402

Applicant(s)

AMIT ET AL.

Examiner

Tremayne M. Norris

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 8/23/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-21 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Carter et al (US pat 6,742,114) and Hoffman et al (US pat 5,613,012).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the batch account" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2137

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1,2,5,8,9,17,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carter et al (US pat 6,742,114).

Regarding claim 1, Carter teaches a computer-implemented method comprising:
receiving a request for network account credentials from an originating account associated with an unpublished object at a dispatch (col.3 lines 30-31 Distributed Deputization Point) associated with a published object, the request directed to the published object associated with the dispatch includes identification of the unpublished object associated with the originating account (col.8 lines 19-33; col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17);

authenticating the originating account at the dispatch (col.8 lines 34-43); and,
upon authenticating the originating account, sending an emblem for a network account to the originating account, the emblem sent to the unpublished object associated with the originating account and having the identification as included with the request (col.9 lines 32-41).

Regarding claim 2, Carter teaches the request is unencrypted, and the emblem is encrypted (col.9 lines 4-17; col.9 lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 5, Carter teaches the emblem comprises a token (col.9 lines 32-41).

Regarding claim 8, Carter teaches the network account for which the emblem is sent from the dispatch to the originating account comprises an agent account of an agent (col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17; col.9 lines 42-52; col.10 lines 22-32).

Regarding claim 9, Carter teaches sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises:

proxy logging on to an agent (col.8 lines 12-15);

remoting an agent account to the originating account upon proxy log on to the agent, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the agent account (col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17; col.9 lines 42-52; col.10 lines 22-32).

Regarding claim 17, Carter teaches a computerized system comprising:

a plurality of network accounts, each account capable of being proxy logged onto and of being remoted to another account (col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17; col.9 lines 42-52; col.10 lines 22-32); and,

a dispatch designed to field requests for network account credentials from the plurality of accounts, and to satisfy each request for network account credentials from an originating account by proxy logging onto an account capable of being proxy logged

Art Unit: 2137

onto such that credentials for the account are remoted back to the originating account as the network account credentials requested (col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17; col.9 lines 32-52; col.10 lines 22-32).

Regarding claim 19, Carter teaches the dispatch is further designed to satisfy a request for network account credentials from an originating account only upon first authenticating the originating account (col.8 lines 34-43).

Regarding claim 20, Carter teaches a published object is associated with the dispatch, the published object designed to receive the request for network account credentials (col.8 lines 19-33; col.9 lines 4-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2137

6. Claims 3,4,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter.

Regarding claims 3,4, and 21, Examiner takes official notice that message queues and files are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize message queues or files in order to store or transport data.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter.

Regarding claim 10, Carter teaches the emblem is expirable, such that the method further comprises determining whether the emblem is about to expire (col.11 lines 17-26). Carter does not teach renewing the emblem with a renewing authority, however, Examiner takes official notice that renewing an expired emblem/token/certificate is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a renewing function in order to allow a user to continue credential usage after their allotted time has expired.

8. Claims 6,7,11-16,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter, and further in view of Hoffman et al (US pat 5,613,012).

Regarding claim 6, Carter teaches the method of claim 1, but does not teach the network account to the originating account comprises remoting the batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account. Hoffman teaches the network account to the originating account comprises remoting the batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account (col.39 line 55 thru col.40 line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter's deputized computer system with Hoffman's identification system for electronic transactions in order to provide a fraud-resistant system that will allow a user to access multiple accounts and procure all services authorized to the user (Hoffman col.5 line 25 thru col.6 line 27).

Regarding claim 7, Cater teaches the method of claim 1, but does not teach sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises remoting the batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account. Hoffman teaches sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises remoting the batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account (col.39 line 55 thru col.40 line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter's deputized computer system with Hoffman's identification system for electronic transactions in order to provide a fraud-

Art Unit: 2137

resistant system that will allow a user to access multiple accounts and procure all services authorized to the user (Hoffman col.5 line 25 thru col.6 line 27).

Regarding claim 11, Carter teaches a computer-implemented method comprising:

receiving an unencrypted request for network account credentials from an originating account at a dispatch (col.8 lines 19-33; col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17);

authenticating the originating account at the dispatch (col.8 lines 34-43);

upon authenticating the originating account,

proxy logging on to an agent account; and,

transmitting an emblem including network account credentials for one of the agent account back to the originating account to satisfy the request for network account credentials sent from the originating account (col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17; col.9 lines 42-52; col.10 lines 22-32).

Carter does not teach transmitting an emblem including a batch account.

Hoffman teaches transmitting an emblem including a batch account (col.39 line 55 thru col.40 line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter's deputized computer system with Hoffman's identification system for electronic transactions in order to provide a fraud-resistant

Art Unit: 2137

system that will allow a user to access multiple accounts and procure all services authorized to the user (Hoffman col.5 line 25 thru col.6 line 27).

Regarding claim 12, Carter and Hoffman in combination teach the method of claim 11, in addition Carter teaches the originating account has associated therewith an unpublished object, the unpublished object identified within the request from the originating account for credentials of a network account, and designed to receive the agent account emblem satisfying the request (col.8 lines 19-33; col.8 line 62 thru col.9 line 17).

Regarding claims 13 and 15, Examiner takes official notice that message queues and files are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize message queues or files in order to store or transport data.

Regarding claim 14, Carter and Hoffman in combination teach the method of claim 11, in addition Carter teaches a published object is associated with the dispatch, the published object designed to receive the request for network account credentials (col.8 lines 19-33; col.9 lines 4-17).

Regarding claim 16, Carter and Hoffman in combination teach the method of claim 11, in addition Carter teaches the emblem is expirable (col.11 lines 17-26). Carter

does not teach renewing the emblem with a renewing authority, however, Examiner takes official notice that renewing an expired emblem/token/certificate is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a renewing function in order to allow a user to continue credential usage after their allotted time has expired.

Regarding claim 18, Carter teaches the system of claim 17, but does not teach returning an emblem including network account credentials for a batch account of the dispatch as the network account credentials requested. Hoffman teaches returning an emblem including network account credentials for a batch account of the dispatch as the network account credentials requested (col.39 line 55 thru col.40 line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Carter's deputized computer system with Hoffman's identification system for electronic transactions in order to provide a fraud-resistant system that will allow a user to access multiple accounts and procure all services authorized to the user (Hoffman col.5 line 25 thru col.6 line 27).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tremayne M. Norris whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2137

272-3874. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tremayne Norris

January 19, 2005



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER